

THE
CONSIDERATIONS
WHICH OBLIGED
PETER MANBY
DEAN of DERRY

To Embrace the CATHOLIQUE RELIGION.

Dedicated to His GRACE the Lord Archbishop of
Ardmagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all *Ireland*.

Psalm 42.

Judica me Deus & discerne causam meam de gente non sancta.

Emitte lucem tuam & veritatem tuam. Ipsa me deduxerunt & adduxerunt in Montem Sanctum tuum, & in Tabernacula tua.

Dublin Castle the 11th. of March 1686.

This following Discourse is allowed to be Printed.

Tho Sheridan.

Printed for Christopher Paus, in *Christ Church Lane*, with several
other Catholick Books, 1687.

THE
CONSIDERATIONS

WHICH OBLIGED

PETER MANNBY

DEAN of DERRY

To Embrace the CATHOLIQUE RELIGION.

Dedicated to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of
Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland.

1711.

Quia me Deus & discipuli eius in medio gentium non sinit.
Finitis sacris tam & veritatem tuam. Ipsi me deherent & ad-
herent in eorum sanctum tuum & in Tabernaculum tuum.

Under the title of March 18.

This following Discourse is allowed to be printed.

Geo. Sparrow.

Printed for Christopher Evans, in Christ Church Lane, near
St. Dunstons Church, 1687.

To the R. E. A. D. E. R.

When a Protestant rehearses this Article of his Creed, I Believe one Holy Catholique and Apostolique Church, I should faine understand what Church he means: whether the Church of England alone as established by Law, or the Church of England in Communion with other Churches? If the former, then his meaning is, I believe one Holy Protestant Church as settled in England by Act of Parliament. If the latter, I desire to know, with what other Church under the Heavens does the Church of England Communicate in Sacraments and Liturgy: whether with Lutherans, Calvinists, Waldenses, or Greek Church: If with none of all these, why does he pretend to believe one Holy Catholique Church? This Church established by Law being Catholique neither at this time nor place, because not visible any where for many Ages before Edward VI.

Good Reader, If we believe our selves Catholiques, let us not fancy to our selves a Church separated from all the rest of the World. And therefore Peruse I beseech you Sir Pauls Question, What? came the Word of God out from you (the established Church) or came it unto you alone? 1 Cor. 14. 36. Hath the Divine Goodness left all the World in darkness except our Islands? and us too, for so many Ages until Henry VIII. took a fancy to Ann Boleyn? Is the Catholique Church dissolved away to the Church of England? perhaps you will answer Me, that by one Holy Catholique Church you understand all the variety of Protestants: A Church of Englandmen, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Independents, Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy men, Quakers, &c. but all these wanting that first and essential mark of the Catholique Church, that of Unity, cannot be that one Holy Society intended by our Creed. And moreover, this makes Protestantcy so wandering and uncertain a thing, that I for my part do not well understand it. Can you say, that Lutherans & Church of Englandmen are the same in all material points; the Lutherans holding in Corporal Presence

in the Sacrament, and the Church of England denying it? or that Calvinists and good Protestants are the same in all necessary matters, the former having no Orders of Priests and Bishops, consequently no true Sacraments, no power of Binding and Absolving Sinners? besides, the Catholique Church can never fail: But as for those Sects of Protestants; Who ever saw or heard of them for many years before Henry VIII.

Well, but you will insist upon it that God hath his People amongst all sorts of Protestants; which Answer, I have sometimes heard out of the mouths of Protestants. And it calls to my mind those excellent words of the Late King's Second Paper, viz. The Protestants are not of the Church of England as 'tis the true Church from whence there can be no Appeal but because the Discipline of that Church is conformable at that present to their Fancies, which as soon as it shall contradict, or vary from they are ready to embrace or join with the next Congregation of People, whose Discipline or Worship agrees with their own Opinion at that time &c. And further it brings to my remembrance these Words of a certain Person, once of my acquaintance, he was a Presbyterian and gave his Son leave to go for New England to seek his Fortune. His said a Friend of his, they are all Independents there, and your Son will be in danger of losing his Principles. I care not what he be, replied the other, so he be not a Papist.

In a word (dear Reader) it concerns thee to understand a right that Article of thy Creed, I believe one Holy Catholique and Apostolique Church; because the only way to be at rest in this World, and happy in the World to come, is to find out that Church upon whose Authority thou mayst rely. Noah's Dove found no rest for the sole of her Foot, until she returned into the Ark. No more wilt thou, but shalt be tossed to and fro upon the unstable waters of Schism, until thou return into the Ark of our Holy Catholique Church. I pray recollect what St. Paul admonishes concerning Schism. I beseech you Brethren by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no Schism among you. So it is written, but that ye glorify God with one mind and one mouth. That is, that ye

he serve God: not only saying the same things but the same words especially about your Sacraments and Liturgy. For by one Spirit we (meaning all Christians) are Baptized into one Body. Therefore he exhorts them to take heed of such Teachers as have no Mission or Authority for what they say, but only good Words and fair Speeches to deceive the hearts of the simple.

In the following Discourse, I hope the Reader shall find it brassy and yet fully made out to him, that the first Reformers had no Mission for what they did; nor any pretence to justify their Separation and breach of Unity but only the Scripture as interpreted by themselves, not only without but against the Authority of the present Catholic Church: out of which a Man may have all things except Salvation, said St. Augustin. And further he shall find me pressing for an Answer to such Questions as these, viz. *Whether the first Reformers had the Orders of the Roman Catholic Bishops?* *Whether a Presbyterian Minister, having received Orders from a Protestant Bishop, can by virtue of such Orders, pronounce the Church of England a corrupt Church?* *Whether Cranmer and his Associates could condemn the Church of Rome by pretence of the Mission they received from her Bishops?*

Whether an Act of Parliament in France, Spain, or Germany, be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in England for Protestantism? And in case there be no Judge to determine what be the true sense of Scripture, *whether Roman Catholics or Protestants?* *Whether the Catholic sense be not as good as the Protestant's?*

Finally, I intreat the Protestant Reader to peruse Dr. Heylin's History of the Reformation, a Book that speaks bitterly enough against Popery, yet in remembrance of Fact, fullmosthly written, that notwithstanding all English Burnet's industry to diminish its credit, it hath opened the Eyes of many good Protestants. See Doctor Burnet's Character of it in his Preface to his first Volume, where he censures it not for telling untruths in matter of History, but rather for speaking too much truth. He denies not but Dr. Heylin was a sincere Protestant, but violently carried away by some particular conceits, (these are

Burnet's words) and is not to be excused that he never vouched any Authority for what he writ, &c. *This is the worst he could say, and 'tis an intreat that Heylin writ upon uncertain grounds, as Doctor Burnet would insinuate. For thus Heylin himself will satisfy the Reader in the Preface to his History, viz. As for my performance in this work; in the first place I am to tell thee, that towards the raising of this Fabrick, I have not borrowed my Materials only out of vulgar Authors, but searched into the Registers of the Convocation, consulted all such Acts of Parliament as concerned my purpose, advised with many Foreign Writers of great name and credit, exemplified some Records and Charters of no common Quality, many rare Pieces in the Famous Cottonian Library, and not a few Debates and Orders of the Council Table: And next I am to let thee know that in the whole carriage of this Work I have assumed unto my self the freedom of a just Historian, delivering nothing for a Truth without good Authority: but so delivering the Truth as to witness for me that I am neither byassed by Love or Hatred. If I seem sharp at any time, as sometimes I may, it is but in such cases only and on such occasions in which there is no good to be done by Lenitives, &c.* *I have transferred this passage, lest the Reader should be imposed on by Burnet's character of the ingenious Heylin, whose History he would disprove to advance the reputation of his own.* And I pray the Reader to observe that Doctor Burnet does not instance one passage of any moment in all Heylin's Work, wherein that he dares say he is false, which certainly he would have done, had he found any such. But he delivers many things in such a manner and so strangely, that one would think (says Burnet) he had been secretly set on by those of the Church of Rome, though I doubt not but he was a sincere Protestant, &c. But what sort of People they were who set on Dr Burnet to write his History is very well known. I will instance some passages out of Heylin, which I suppose did not please Doctor Burnet, viz. *That this was done in order to a Reformation under Henry VIII. seemed to be accidental only, and by the by, rather designed to provide an end to the out of any settled purpose to Reform the Church, and therefore omitted*

mitted and refused again, as those ends had variance. But when the work was carried on with a constant hand (under Edward VI) the Prelates of the Church cooperating with the King and his Council (&c.) And scarce had they brought it to this pass when King Edward dyed, whose death I cannot reckon for an infelicity to the Church of England (saith the Doctor). For being ill principled in himself, and easily inclined to embrace such Councils as were offered to him, it is not to be thought but that the rest of the Bishopricks (before sufficiently impoverished) must have followed the Fate of *Durham*, and the poor Church be left as destitute of Lands and Ornaments, as when she came into the World in her natural Nakedness. Nor was it like to happen otherwise in the following Reign, (as wit. of the Lady Jane Grey) if it had lasted longer then a nine days wonder. For *Dudley*, Duke of Northumberland, who then rul'd the roast, and had before dissolved, and in hope devoured the wealthy Bishoprick of *Durham*, might easily have possessed himself of the Bishopricks of *Tork* and *Carlisle*, &c. *Dudley's* Son was Married to the said Lady Jane Proclaimed Queen, to maintain whose Interest and Title, the poor remainder of the Churches Patrimony was in all probability (says Heylin) to have been shared amongst those of that Party to make 'em sure; but the Wisdom of this great *Achitophel* (*Dudley*) being turned to foolishness, he fell into the hands of the publick Hang-man, &c. Reader, behold the spirit of Reformation which Governed those times. They are Heylin's own words:

But what is all this (you will say) to *Cranmer* and other Clergy-men, whose intentions of Reformation were sincere and honest? As for *Cranmer* then, you may judge of his Spirit by what I shall remark to you presently out of Doctor *Burnet's* Records. Only observe the Duke of *Somerſet's* History in short, thus out of Heylin. Being condemned to dye by his own Brethren of the Reformation, he was so desolative in his Judgment, as not to crave the benefit of his Clergy, which might have saved his Life; whether it were some secret judgment on him from above, that he who had destroyed so many Churches, invaded the estate of so many Cathedrals, deprived so many learned men of their Means and Livelihood: (for being Pa-

pists) should want the benefit of Clergy in his greatest extremity
 &c. Observe the remarkable fates of those grand Reformers. Now as
 for Cranmer's spirit, take notice of it from his own words recorded by
 Doctor Burnet, which the Reader may consult, to save me the labour
 of transcribing one or two passages. Cranmer, with
 the rest of the English Bishops, being desired to return their Answer
 severally to this Question; Whether in the New Testament be requir-
 ed any Consecration of a Bishop or Priest? Cranmer Answers thus
 under his hand, viz. In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be
 a Priest or Bishop, needeth no Consecration by the Scripture; for the
 Word thereunto is sufficient. In which Assertion, all the rest of the
 Bishops except one were against him. And being consulted about another Question; Whether Bishops and
 Priests only may excommunicate by God's Law? To which he returns
 this Answer under his hand, viz. A Bishop or a Priest by the Scrip-
 ture is neither commanded nor forbidden to Excommunicate, but
 where the Laws of any Country give them Authority to Excommuni-
 cate, there they ought to use the same in such Crimes as the Law have
 such Authority in. And where the Laws of the Country forbid them,
 there they have no Authority at all. And they that be no Priests
 may also Excommunicate, if the Law allow thereunto. Here he had
 the spirit of Hobbs of Malmesbury. And about another Question, whether by Authority of Christ's
 words, quoniam remittitis peccata, remittuntur illis? Christians are
 bound to confess their secret sins to a Priest? He answered in the ne-
 gative against all the rest of the Bishops except one. Let the Reader
 consult Burnet, and compare him with Heylin; in both which it will
 appear, that the Grand Reformers, Somerset, Dudley, &c. made their
 Breakfast only of Abby Lands, intending to Dine upon the Bishops
 Lands. Burnet strains all his wit to palliate their doings and paint
 them out to advantage. Heylin represents them honestly for the most
 part, and in their own colours; and in my poor opinion, writes more
 French and beaten English. He was full of a generous indignation to
 see so much Stripping and Plundering of God's House under pretence of
 Reformation. *Tu idolum facis & Sacrilegium facis.*

FAREWELL

May it please Your Grace,

I Humbly beg leave to send Your Grace this short Account of my Reconcilement to the Catholick Church.

God be praised it was not any consideration of Temporal Interest that inclin'd me to it, as all that have known me these several years past can witness. But having often reflected on the uncertainty and variety of the Protestant Spirit, and perused the Books of Catholicks without prejudice, especially the Mass it self, I found my self deceiv'd by the Reports which I had entertain'd of Catholick Religion.

Here are three Points chiefly wherein I could never satisfy my self, since I began to study the Controversy between both Churches. One is the Authority or Mission of the first Reformers. The second is the want of Confession in the Church of England. The third is the Answer given by Protestants to that Question in his late Majesties Papers, *Where is that one Holy Catholique and Apostolique Church which we do profess to believe in the two Creeds?*

As to the first, I have seen Dr. Bramhall's and Mr. Mason's Vindications of the Church of England; but could never find any satisfactory Answer to this Question, Who authoriz'd the first Reformers to Preach their Protestant Doctrine, and Administer their Protestant Sacraments? Their Priestly or Episcopal Character, whether valid or no, I meddle not with to prevent Disputes; although I think it no easy matter to find out who Ordain'd the first Protestant Bishops; there being none to do it

B.

excepte

except Roman Catholick Prelates, who never use to Consecrate any Protestants. This testimony I lately met with in the Records annexed to Doctor *Burnet's* second Volume of his History of Reformation.

In the Month of *March* anno 1553. *Queen Mary* sent this, amongst other Articles, to the Bishop of *London*, viz. Touching such persons as were heretofore (meaning the days of *Edward 6.*) promoted to any Orders after the new sort and fashion of Orders, considering they were not ordered in very deed, the Bishop of the Diocese finding otherwise sufficiency and ability in those men, may supply that thing which wanted in them before, and then according to his discretion admit them to minister, &c. This royal testimony, with the honest Protestant Reader, will not be dispilable. I shall not insist upon it, but only observe at present that *Cranmer* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and *Latimer* Bishop of *Worcester*, at the time of their Consecration were professed Roman Catholicks in all points, except perhaps the Pope's Supremacy; but afterwards turning Protestants, and pronouncing the Church of *Rome* Idolatrous, I would fain know by whose Authority.

The truth is, they were first Ordained Catholick Bishops according to the *Roman Pontifical*, and afterwards made themselves Protestant Bishops. But I understand not how a man can forsake the Church of *England*, and Preach Presbyterian Doctrine by virtue of his Protestant Orders; nor how any man can justify his Protestant Doctrine by Authority of his Popish Mission.

This was *Cranmer's* and *Latimer's* case, who at the time of their Consecration (which was in the days of *Henry 8.*) professed seven Sacraments; whether they believed so many, is a question; afterwards, anno 1536, retrenched them to three, that is to say, Baptism, Penance, and the Lord's Supper; then to two, anno 1549. By whose Authority or Mission, I cannot tell. So that Protestantism seems to me to have been born into the World not like honestly begotten Children, whose Parents are known, but rather like a By-blow, whose Father is doubtful. I have known some Presbyterians, when questioned about their Mission, pretend they did

receive

receive it from Church of *England* Prelates; but being further inter-
rogated, did that Church Authorize you to Preach against her
Sacraments or Liturgy; there was no Answer to be had. I know
it will be said that the Protestant Religion is Authoriz'd by Act
of Parliament, and so is not Presbytery. A *Parliamentary* Mis-
sion then our first Reformers had, and no other that I can find.
But whether the Parliament, being a Civil Authority, has Power
to send Missioners to preach the Gospel, and administer Sacra-
ments, I do not well understand. If they have, I suppose every
Member of Parliament may preach and administer Sacraments if
he pleases; because no man can give that Authority unto others
which he hath not himself. And if *English* Parliaments may
preach and administer Sacraments, I doubt not but the *French*,
Spanish, *Scottish*, and *Irish* may do the same; and then what unity
of Spirit or agreement in Faith Christians are like to have, I could
never understand.

To this, two Answers are wont to be given, which I will not
conceal from the Reader. One is, that *Cranmer* and his Associates
were sent and ordered by the *Roman Pontifical* to instruct the peo-
ple according to the *Scriptures*. This is the Answer of Dr. *Bur-*
net. *The Church* (saith he) *was over run with Errors and Corruptions*,
this Cranmer saw, and was obliged to undeceive the people. Ve-
ry good. But I intreat the Reader to inspect the Records afore-
said, published by the Doctor himself, and annexed to the first
and second Volume of his History: where he shall find *Cranmer*
and one or two Bishops more pretending Errors and Corruptions,
and driving on a *Reformation* against the major Vote of the *Eng-*
lish Bishops. He shall find the same *Cranmer* at the time of this
Consecration owning and professing those very Doctrines which af-
terwards he called Errors and Corruptions; so that still I must ask
the old Question, by whose Authority did he condemn that
Church from whom he received his *Mission* and holy Orders? I
desire to know whether an honest Man can preach against the
Liturgy, Sacraments, or Constitution of any Church by virtue
of any Commission he received from it. And whether such

Preacher be not liable to the Censures of that Church? did ever any Church authorize her Priests or Bishops to go and preach the Gospel after their own private Sense or Conscience in contradiction to her declared Doctrine and Worship? Does the Church of *England* give any such Power at this day? No, by no means. Read the *Form* appointed by her for the Ordination of a Priest, where the Bishop is to interrogate the Party thus, *viz* *Do you think in your heart that you be truly called according to the order of this Church of England to the Order and Ministry of Priesthood?* The Answer is, *I think so.* Will you then saith the Protestant Bishop give your diligence always to Minister the Doctrine and Sacraments as this Church and Realm hath received the same according to the Commandments of God? The Answer is, *I will do so by the help of God.*

So that as no honest man can turn *Presbyterian* or *Independant* Preacher by vertue of his *Protestant* Mission; so neither can he preach *Protestant* Doctrine by pretence of a Commission he received from the Church of *Rome*. If any body should ask me, what if the Church be manifestly corrupted with Superstition and Idolatry? in this case why may not able men preach without any Mission? I must beg leave to ask him again, What if the Church finds those Men of Abilities manifestly intoxicated with mistakes of Holy Scripture? with a Spirit of perverseness and a desire of change? or perhaps an evil Eye at the *Lands* of the Church? what is to be done in this case? Let the *Scripture* (he will say) determine the business: But the *Scripture* admits of various interpretations: and I would fain know what Rebel or Heretique shall ever be convict that must be tryed by a *Law* whereof himself must be the Interpreter?

Well, but *Cranmer*, tho he had no Mission to reform, was perhaps a Holy Man! as for his Sanctity, the Reader may be pleased to see him subscribing to a Letter in *Foxes Acts and Monuments* for Excluding his Lawful Sovereign the Princess *Mary* from Succession to the Crown; and afterwards recanting the Protestant Religion, and relapsing into it again when he saw no hopes of a Reprieve.

The

The truth is, when I reflect that *Cromwell* and he were the chief Engineers of the Reformation, first to Divorce *Henry VIII.* from his most virtuous and innocent Wife *Queen Katherine*, then to Marry him to *Ann Bolen*, and afterwards to dissolve that Marriage: Then to destroy Religious Houses, and hang up the poor Abbots; disband four or five Sacraments; set the People a madding after New Lights: I cannot but look upon those two Politicians as the Ring leaders of all that Confusion and Mischief which has since broke out upon the Stage of Great Britain.

So much for the former Answer that *Cranmer* and his Associates were sent and ordained by the *Roman Pontifical* to teach the people according to the Scriptures, which they did according to their own sense of the Scriptures.

If it be said that he preached no new Doctrine, nor administered any new Sacraments, but only the Primitive Doctrine and Sacraments of Jesus Christ according to the sense of the Ancient Fathers, which is the second Answer: I pray the Reader to remember that this was the very Answer of *Luther*, *Soetmus*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, and most other Reformers. I am not now disputing what Doctrine he preached, but who sent him to preach his Protestant Doctrine, and administer his Protestant Sacraments? 'Tis not his Doctrine but *Mission* that I am now enquiring after. *How shall they preach except they be sent*, saith *St. Paul*. 'Tis not a pretence of true Doctrine without external and lawful Mission that makes a man a Preacher of the Gospel. The necessity of *Mission* appears from God's own word, *Jerem. 23. I have not sent these Prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied*, verse 21. *therefore they shall not profit this people at all* saith the Lord, verse 32.

There are but two sorts of Mission in Holy Scripture, the one Ordinary, the other Extraordinary: The former is the Licence and Approbation of the Church in becoming: The later is the immediate Voice and Inspiration of God himself ever attested by Miracles, prediction of future and publick Events, &c. Now as for the first Preachers of *Reformation*, some body must send them

by

by an Ordinary or Extraordinary Commission, or they must run of their own heads. *Sur & latro est* saith *St. Cyprian* *qui a nemine missus nisi a seipso* that is to say, He enters not by the Door as honest men do, but seeks Windows, Corners, or By-ways of his own; as if the Divine Providence were wanting (when necessity requires) to send Preachers into the Church, or to furnish them with sufficient *Credentials* so as to leave us without excuse. Did not the Hand of God strike *Uzzab* with sudden death for presuming to put forth his hand, uncommanded, to support the Ark from falling, *1 Sam. 6*. And King *Uzzab* with a Leprosie to the day of his death for offering Incense which apper- tained to the Priests alone. Are not these things recorded for our instruction?

The not considering this matter hath brought a *World* of confusion upon these Kingdoms; and till the People can be brought to understand it, we are never like to see an end of our Religious Distractions. For why may not I (may a *Presbyterian Minister* say) having the same Authority of Scripture which *Cranmer* pretended to, preach against the *Superstition* of *Common Prayer*, as well as he against the *Idolatry* of the *Mass*.

The Second point wherein I was dissatisfied was the want of *Confession* to a Priest. I found Protestant Sermons had some Authority with the people, but not much for lack of this curb up on their Vices. *Catholiques* commit sin, 'tis true; but call themselves to an account for it by *Confession* and Submission to their Ghostly Fathers. Protestants sin likewise without calling themselves to any such Reckoning; because they can make a shift without it.

I have divers times discoursed with Protestant Ministers, and some Protestant Bishops about this matter. I was sorry to find no Harmony in their opinions. Some said 'twas a thing allow'd by the Church of *England* as very expedient in some cases, but no matter of necessity. Others thought it but a Picklock of Secrets, and a matter of ill consequence. But when I urg'd that the Church of

England

England seems to require, is in her Office for the Communion and Visitation of the Sick, the reply was, she does it with this proviso, *As a man be troubled with any doubts or scruples*; Which reply will but add more to my dissatisfaction. For thought it is Confession nothing else but to be resolv'd in our scruples and doubts? I have sometimes wished her Exhortation before the Communion, otherwise worded then saying, *if there be any of you which cannot quiet his own Conscience, let him come to me or some other Learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief, &c.* Which words seem to allow as much as that sinners may satisfy their own Consciences well enough without troubling themselves for the Absolution of a Priest, although a Priest may be had.

In short, I confess my dulness understands neither the Piety nor Policy, of leaving off the practice of *nothing* so approved and frequented by all the Christian World, except the people of our Islands, and some few others that call themselves *Reformed*. And that only for some *abuses* which possibly may attend it. By this means the Church of *England* appears to me to have lost that interest in the Consciences of the people, which both the *Roman* and *Greek* Priests are happy in at this day. And what if some Catholics are never the better for it? what are many Protestants the better for all the Sermons they hear, and Sacraments they receive? *As a man confesses our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness.* And yet to him seven promises which he hath thrice repeated in the Gospel. *Whosoever confesses and repents, they are committed unto them.* But other promise that he will do it without the ministry of his Priests, we read not of in the New Testament. I pray the Reader to consider whether private Sinners in the Church of *England* do not offend God at as much cheaper rate then in the Church of *Rome*; since in the Church of *Rome* they are bound to some Penances. But in the Church of *England* they may confess to their Ministers and do Penances if they will; or if they will not, they may let it alone. *For he can satisfy for his own Confessions.* (With other Comforts Prayer) *let him come to me, or*

some other discreet and learned Minister, and open their grief, So that Christians may receive the Communion of Christs Body and Blood without a previous Confession and Absolution by a Priest, was never heard of in the Catholique Church until the days of Henry VIII.

The third difficulty was the Answer given by Protestants to that Question in the Late King's Papers; *Where is that one Holy Catholique and Apostolique Church which we do profess to be? Leave in the two Creeds?* Was there any such Society as one Holy Catholique Church extant upon the face of the Earth when Cranmer began his Reformation? and what Provinces of the Earth did this Church inhabit? This is a plain Question, and desires no Answer but of the *ubi*, or place where to find it. This Society, if it be not an *Idea Platonica*, must appear somewhere. And when that is known, the next Doubt is, Did Cranmer believe himself a Member of it? and if so, I would fain know who gave him Authority to Reform this one Holy Catholique and Apostolique Church? to set up Altar against Altar? If there were no such Church extant upon the face of the Earth, as there must be none in case she were lapsid into *Idolatry*; what became of our Saviours prediction, that the *Gates of Hell shall never prevail against his Church*? I am told that Dr S. ——— has answered these Questions, by saying that the Church of Rome are Idolaters, and yet a true Church at the same time: Which Answer I confess I do not understand. For what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols? (saith St. Paul) and what concord hath Christ with Belial? for so are the Temple of the Living God, what Communion hath light with darkness? 2 Cor. 6. 16. What Idolaters and yet a true Church? tis as much as to say, they are in the way to Heaven and Hell at the same time. But such Answers must be given when there are no better. I confess I never read this Answer in him, I only have it by Hear say. Surely, to teach and practise *Idolatry* destroys the very Being of a Christian Church. And if the Church of Rome be no Christian Church, there

there is an end of the Episcopal Succession of the Church of England, and consequently of the Church it self.

To conclude, that which obliged me most of all to the Church of Rome, was the perusal of her Books of Devotion: such as Saint Francis Sales Bishop of Geneva his *Introduction to a Devout Life*. Neirembergius of the *Difference betwixt Time and Eternity*. Lewis Granatensis of the *Love of God*. Kempis of the *Following of Christ*, &c. Especially the *Mass* it self: which I read without prejudice, and compared the Spirit of Piety, which I found there, with the Spirit of Reformation.

In stead of Idolatry, I found the most elevated and judicious Prayers to the Holy Trinity: concluding in the Name of our Saviour Jesus Christ: besides the daily Sacrifice offered up to Almighty God according to his own appointment, *Do this in remembrance of me*. All this I observed, and then said within my self, God forgive the Wickedness of those people who quarrel at this, and persecute it with so blind and furious an aversion. So did the Jews crucify our Saviour.

What fault can any ingenuous Protestant find with this or any other Prayer of the *Mass*? *Suscipe sancte Pater, omnipotens aeternus Deus, hanc immaculatam hostiam quam ego indignus famulus tuus offero tibi Deus meus unus & vero*, &c. Accept, O holy Father Almighty and Eternal God, this unsported Sacrifice which I thy unworthy Servant offer unto thee, my living and true God, for my innumerable sins, offences and negligences, and for all here present, as also for all faithful Christians both living and dead, that it may avail both me and them unto everlasting life, *Amen*. If this be the *Mass*, who but a perverse ill natur'd Phanatick can except against it?

As for the Confession said at the beginning of *Mass*, the Reader shall find Protestants objecting nothing against it, but what Presbyterians do against that *Canticle* in the Common Prayer Book, called *Benedicite omnia opera*. O *Ambrosius, Azarias and Misael*, praise ye the Lord, is as rank Popery with the Presbyterians,

terians, as any thing in the *Mass*, or Litanies of our Lady. For what's that (say they) but to invoke dead men, who don't hear us. Thus they will interpret it in their own sense, and not in the sense of the Church of England.

In a word, I found the Church of England beholding to the *Mass* for the best Flowers in her Communion Service. And since some Protestants will believe nothing but their senses, let them read it as I have done, and believe their own eyes. The objection of its being said in the *Latin Tongue*, allows every man to hear it that understands *Latin*. And as for unlearned Catholics, if the truth were known, they understand as much or more of it than ~~illiterate~~ Protestants do of the Common Prayer. What does the Protestant Multitude understand of the Predictions of *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*, *Zechariah* read in their Churches by appointment of the Common Prayer? How many Expositions of the *Mass* are extant in Print by Commandment of the Church? so that no man can be ignorant of it that desires to be informed. How much more universal and vulgar is the *Latin* than the *English* Tongue? Had not the Jewish Church (being then the only true Church in the World) almost all her Scriptures and publick Service for fourteen Generations, that is to say, from the Captivity of *Babylon* unto Christ in the old *Hebrew*? a Language not then understood by the Common People. Did our Saviour or his Apostles ever reprehend the Jews for this? or for not translating their Scriptures into the vulgar Language? If the Service of God must be said in the maternal Language of every Nation, where shall an *English* man in *France* or *Spain*, that understands not the Language, go to serve God upon the Lords Day? This would destroy all Community of Sacraments and Liturgy between the members of the Catholic Church, which being one Body or Society of men, cannot be like the Builder of *Babel*, who could not understand one anothers Language. Now of beseech you Brethren, (saith Saint Paul,)

Paul, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no Schisms among you, that ye may with one mind and one mouth Glorifie God: 1 Cor. I. 10. Rom. 15. 6.

In fine, let the Reader compare that Devotion which Catholics pay to the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, with that which most Protestants shew to the Common Prayer, and then see how much better we are by reforming the *Mass* into *English*. As for Saint Paul's 14th Chapter of his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, I humbly think it not well understood by Protestants. If any man be ignorant, saith he, let him be ignorant. Wherefore Brethren, covet to Prophecy, and forbid not to speak with Tongues, ver. 39. God is not the Author of Confusion, but of Peace, ver. 33.

Upon the whole matter, I desire to be inform'd whether the Protestant Church had any other foundation (setting aside an Act of Parliament) then every man's own reason, or which is the same thing, the Scripture interpreted by every man's Reason. There are but two Bases whereupon to settle our selves, the Scripture and Fathers expounded by my own Reason, or the Scriptures and Fathers expounded by the Voice of the present Visible Church. This later is *Papish*, and cannot support a Reformed *Fabrick*.

I have sometimes wonder'd at this Assertion of Calvin. *Instit. Lib. 4. Cap. 1.* (so incoherent with his own Principles of Reformation) *extra Ecclesia gremiam nulla speranda salus nec remissio peccatorum quia non est alius in vitam ingressus*; which I think may be thus rendered into English; He that will enter into Life, let him mortifie the pride of his own Reason, and humbly cast himself at the feet of the *Catholic Church*. If this be the meaning of his words, as it must be in case he believed any such thing as *one Holy Catholic Church*; how he will justify his Reformation at the day of Judgment, I cannot imagine.

In this Paper therefore I presume not to assert my own reason (which I confess to be as weak as any body else can think it) but the Authority of the Church against the Arrogance of the first Reformers. This difference I understand betwixt the spirit of Catholiques and of Heretiques; the former make use of their Reason with submission, the later with contradiction and petulancy against the Church: and against the expresse words of Christ, *he that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me.*

Cranmer had no Mission from Heaven, nor yet from the present visible Church to authorize his doings; but made himself Judge, Witness, and Accuser. So did Luther, so did Calvin, Socinus, Knipperdoling, &c. how they will answer it at the last day I cannot understand.

A word or two more before I make an end. I know divers loyal Persons of the Church of England, who are Protestants by the tyranny of Prejudice or Interest, but Catholiques by Inclination: of them I beg leave to ask a few Questions. What Priesthood or Holy Orders have Protestants, but what they confess to have received from Roman Catholique Bishops? who gave them Authority to pronounce themselves sound Members, and the Church of Rome a corrupt Arm of the Catholique Church? did not the Presbyterians, anno 1641. pretend the very same warrant of Scripture for Reforming the Church of England? and the Independents for supplanting the Presbyterians, anno 1647. the Presbyterians (said Hugh Peters) are no other than Gibeonites, who may help to hew Stones and square Timber for a more glorious Reformation.

Now as for Roman Catholiques, do they ever say Mass to any other Object but the Living God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? read the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and see whether they attribute any thing to Angels or Saints, but as the Ministers and Favourites of the Living God, receiving from him whatever understanding they may have of our Affairs

Affairs upon earth. The Angels must know our Affairs, be-
 cause they are ministering Spirits sent forth for the good of those
 who shall be heirs of Salvation; and because they rejoiced at the
 Conversion of Sinners: and have glorified Saints no commu-
 nication or intelligence with the Angels. As for the Images
 of Christ's humane nature, see the 25th Session of the Coun-
 cil of Trent, and enquire whether Roman Catholics pay a-
 ny more respects to them then Protestants do to the Elements
 of Bread and Wine, which (say they) are but a Figure or
 Image of Christ's Body and Blood. *Omnia Superstitio in imagin-
 um usu sacro tollatur*, saith that Council; Let all Superstition
 be taken away in the use of Images; and then gives it in
 charge to all Bishops to look to it. The Church of England
 Protestants are every jot as offensive to us (say the Presbyte-
 rians) kneeling before the Elements of Bread and Wine, as the
 Papists kneeling before the Images of Christ. I humbly re-
 commend to Protestants the perusal of a late Book entituled
Pax Vobis: and of another styled *Considerations upon the Coun-
 cil of Trent*, by R. H.

I say no more, only give thanks to Almighty God with all
 my heart, that I am escaped out of the unstable Waters of
Schism into the Ark of Christ's Church. And I beseech him
 to inspire me with that Spirit of Devotion which I observ'd in
 the Mass and other Books of Catholics. As for the ill Practices
 of some, and the ill Opinions of other Roman Catholics, which
 Protestants are wont to charge upon the whole Church, I pass
 it over as no argument at all: all Protestants are no more Saints,
 then all Papists. In the Council of Trent an unprejudic'd Rea-
 der shall find nothing but what is judicious and pious. And let
 him view Popery not as Protestants, but as Papists represent it,
 who should best know their own Religion.

In the Church of Rome he shall find variety of Religious Or-
 ders, but no *Schism*, nor discord about their Sacraments or Li-
 turgy. *In vestra Ecclesia varietas est, scissura non est.* No con-
 fusion

fashion of Sects; nor disobedience to Superiors; but all things perform'd in excellent order, and God Almighty (cry'd, as he is the Creator and Emperor of the World, with Reverence and Distance.

Quam dilecta sunt Tabernacula tua Domine virtutum! concupiscit & desicit Anima mea in Arria Domini. Beati qui habitans in domo tua, in Saecula Saeculorum laudabunt te. Amen. Psal. 84.

P. S.

If any Protestant Reader, instead of a material Answer to this Discourse, shall think fit to revile the Author, 'tis but what I expect, and what I intend to take no notice of. But I intreat him to read the following *Queries* without his Spectacles of Prejudice and Interest.

Certain Doubts touching the E. N. G. & I. S. A. REFORMATION.

Translated by another Hand

THe English Church is either the whole Catholick Church, or a Member of it; if she be only a Member, then me in the world a Church or Congregation whose Sacraments she owns, unless it be cut off from the rest of the Church. Does she receive the Sacraments of Lutherans or Calvinists, and From whence had Grantat, that first Reformer of the Church of England, his Mission: who sent him to preach the Reformed Gospel: was it either lawful or honest in him to Rebel against the Church of Rome by virtue of the Mission he received from her?

Is it lawful for a Bishop or Minister that falls from the Church of England to preach against her by virtue of the Ministry conford upon him by the same Church?

Whether the want of Mission be a fundamental Error? is doubted, because not to enter by the Door into the Sheepfold is Theft and Robbery.

Whether or no Cranmer enter'd by the door of the Parliaments, or by the door of the Scripture? the last is the common Cant of all Sectaries who claim the Scripture to themselves. Therefore I ask, Is not the Sense of Scriptures diverse and manifold? is it not then necessary to appoint some Judge who will discern the true Sense of Scripture from the false, if you expect ever to see an end of Religious Brawls?

To these Queries I have often sought, but hitherto got no Answer. If you say (what many do offer) that Cranmer and his Associates have received Holy Orders from Christ by the Hands of Roman Bishops; then of course it must be owned, that Roman Bishops received also their Orders from Christ and the Apostles. Therefore they are true Pastors, and consequently are to be heard. By this Answer Protestants seem to me to destroy their own Cause. But you may say, the Roman Bishops receiv'd their Orders not their Doctrine from Christ and the Apostles: very well. Then I desire to know by what Authority did the first Reformers rise up against the Doctrine of the Roman Church? If you do not, untill you know, you do act as Judge, Witness and Party.

'Tis commonly answer'd, the right of reforming it self belongs to every Nation: he is so. Therefore by the like title was the Scotch Nation reformed to Calvinism, the Saxons to Lutheranism, &c. Moreover 'tis false, that the change of Religion in England was the Act of the English Nation and Clergy: a few giddy Heads who gaped for new matters were Authors of it, in the minority of Edward the Sixth. Read the History of those times, where you may plainly find how most of all the Bishops

of England (if you except Cranmer and few more) abhorred the new Gospel.

Furthermore, supposing, but not granting, the Reformation Reformation to have been made by the principallest part of the English Clergy; I question, was it lawful for the Church of England, being but a member of the Catholick Church, to separate her self from the whole Body? If you will say, the Church of England was not in the fault, but the Church of Rome forcing her Errors upon the World; I answer in short, that every Heretic is self acquitted by his own Sentence. Besides that, the Reader may observe, all Presbyterians, excusing their own fall from the Church of England, do object the self same thing, viz. that they have forsaken not the Church, but the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of England.

Whether or no the true Worship of God was depraved over the universal World before Cranmer sprang up? if not, tell me in what part of the World was it extant? was it with the Waldenses? I cannot learn from whence bad Peter Waldo a Merchant of Lyons his Mission, neither do his Sacraments (as I think) please the Church of England.

Whether or no out of the Kingdoms of England and Ireland, there be any pure and Apostolical Worship of God in the world at this present?

Whether it be lawful for the People of England to devise a Church for themselves separated from the rest of the World? by what Authority did they reject the Sacraments and Rites of the Roman Church?

Whether or no Cranmer was the first Archbishop of the Church of England? the reason of this doubt is, because the Archbishops of Canterbury for nine ages before him were all Romans. If he was the first, therefore he wanted Episcopal Succession; for the first of his own Sect succeeds no body. Was he, who wanted Succession, Mission and Miracles, a lawful Pastor?

Whether or no there can be a true Church without lawful Pastors?

floury or true Sacraments with such as are not true Pastors? if not, therefore 'tis better to receive under one kind with Catholicks than under none at all with the Reformed.

Whether the Thirty nine Articles of the Church of England be Articles of Faith or not? if not, therefore none is bound under hazard of his Salvation to believe them; if they be, therefore the Church of England coyne'd new Articles of Faith, besides the twelve delivered to us by Christ and his Apostles.

Whether or no the Reformed Religion may be divided into parts always divisible?

Whether an Argument, touching the Eucharist, taken from the Senses be not fallible? the reason of this doubt is, because the Serpent deceived our first Parents by perswading them to give credit to their own eyes, that they might eat of the Tree of Knowledge, because it was fair to the Eyes. If Mankind hath been deceived then by the Eyes, wherein, I pray, have the other Senses deserved more credit since?

Whether the Church of England may not be changed as the Parliament pleases and will?

Whether or no the Spirit of Calvin denying, and the Spirit of Luther asserting the Corporal Presence of Christ in the Eucharist be the same Spirit? if they be divers Spirits each of them cannot be from God.

Was not John Calvin most impudent in undertaking to reform the whole World, he being but Twenty six years of age, and that without any pretence of Miracles? which Christ himself did not take in hand before he was Thirtie.

Whether the Slaughters, Robberies, ransacking of Churches, Tumults, Schisms, and Civil Wars which happened in the year 1541, did not flow from the Reformation? Would?

Whether or no Afflictions doth abound with Ministers more than England with Fanaticks? where 'tis lawful for every one to understand Scripture according to his own Judgment or Discretion.

Whether or no Elizabeth the first of Anno Bolon in Queen
Katherines life time was a lawfull Heire to the Crowne

Whether or no the Will of Henry the Eighth be commen-
dable, who having expelled one Roman Pope, raised up numbers
of Ropes in his own Subjection

By what Authority did Henry cast off his own Wife Kather-
ine? was it by his own, or by other Authority? Was it by
his own, wherefore might not other Kings likewise dismiss their
Wives at pleasure? If Mary his Daughter by Katherine was
lawfull Heire to the Kingdom, therefore Elizabeth was not, be-
cause it was not lawfull for Henry to have any Wives at all.

If it be a lawfull matter to change a Religion established by
the Parliaments Authority, how was it lawfull for Elizabeth to
overthrow the Catholick Religion established by the Laws of the
Kingdom. Elizabeth drove fourteen Catholique Bishops out of their
Sees, for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy. But how could
they swear Her to be Head of the Church, whom they could not
swear to be Head of the Kingdom?

Did not Cranmer steal his Liturgy out of the Mass-book,
Ritual and Roman Breviary?

Are not Protestants obliged by the Oath of Supremacy to obey
the King as Supreme Governour, as well in all Spiritual things
or Ecclesiastical matters and causes, as in Temporal, &c? what
mean these words, as well in all Spiritual as Temporal matters
and causes, but that Protestants ought to give all manner of Obe-
dience, as well Religious as Civil, to the King? are not they ob-
liged therefore by vertue of this Oath to become Catholicks with
a Catholick King, Calvinists with a Calvinist, Arrians with
an Arrian? Is not according to this Oath, because the King is
alone is Supreme Governour, as well in all Spiritual as Temporal
matters. For these words do acknowledge in the King a Su-
premacy as well Spiritual as Civil, but how can this Spiritual
Jurisdiction appear to be in him, without the Power of the
Keys?

You may saye the King were made by a Lawe sinfull by the Lawe of God and the Kingdome; so is it. Therefore the King is not the Supreme Head under Christ; but the Supreme and Statutes of the Kingdome. But if a Debate should happen between the King and his Subjects about the true Sense of Scripture, who will be Judge? the private Spirit of a man? This, if it be not mistaken, is the Fender and Fountain of Civil Wars.

Why hath such a number of Noble men so greatly favoured the Reformation in Elizabeths time? was it for Conscience sake, or for the Gain of Church Livings?

Why doth the English Mobile (greedy of Novelty) hate Popery? perhaps 'tis because Popery is no novelty.

The Church of England is either fallible or infallible; if it be fallible (as all agree;) therefore it is not grounded upon the Rock, because it may deceive and be deceived.

Was it wisely done of Cardinal Wolsey to overthrow Monasteries, that he might erect Colledges? 'tis doubted, because the Tree of Knowledge was not the Tree of Life.

Is not a much better and more exact Translation of the Bible wanting in the Church of England, the sacred Text being in very many places corrupted in order to favour the Flesh, and to forward Schism; as for example, Gal. 5. 17. Dan. 4. 24. where the Prophet speaketh thus to King Nabuchadonosor; Quamobrem, Rex, consilium meum placeat tibi, & peccata tua elemosynis redime, & iniquitates tuas misericordiam pauperum. Which Text the English Bible hath very corruptly after this manner; Wherefore, O King, break off thy Sins by Righteousness, and thine Iniquities by shewing Mercy to the Poor. Whereas it should be translated thus: Redeem thy Sins by Alms deeds, and thine Iniquities by shewing Mercy to the Poor. and these words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 7. 9. Quod si non se continent, nubant, But if they cannot contain, let them marry. Where this word (cannot) was designedly inserted to favour the Flesh.

Again, these words of Christ Matt. 23. 35. are interpreted in
 favour of the Gosses. Non omnes capere verbum illud sed qui
 datus est. All men cannot receive this saying, but such
 as whom it is given. And again the words of Job. chap. 7. 1.
 and several other Texts, particularly that of Amos. 8. 11. against
 the Image of Christ. Non facies tibi sculptile. The word
 Sculptile is well translated by the Seventy into *idolus*, because
 because God forbade Idols, not Images.

It is said such a manner of Translation is not in for Conscience sake, as
 Reformation in Elizabeth's time was it for Conscience sake, as
 for the sake of Church Livings?

Why hath the English Bible (Greek of Nicene) late Pope
 23. perhaps its because Popery is no more.

The Church of England is either fallible or infallible; if it is
 fallible (as all others) therefore it is not grounded upon the Rock,
 because it may deceive and be deceived.

Was it wisely done of Cardinal Wolsey to convert the Mass
 into that he might evil Colledge, his double, because the Tree
 of Knowledge was not the Tree of Life.

Is not a much better and more exact Translation of the Bible
 wanting in the Church of England, since Text being in re-
 ty many places corrupted in our own the Bible, and so for-
 ward 2000; as for example, Gal. 2. 27. Dan. 4. 4. where the
 proper should be to King Nabuchodonosor; O memento
 Rex, cum sum magnus placeat tibi, & postea tu es comes
 regis. & iniquitas in hoc verbo panem. Which
 Text the English Bible hath very corruptly after this manner:
 Whosoever, O King, break off thy sins by righteousness, and
 these indignities by showing Mercy to the Poor. It should be
 should be translated thus: Remember thy sins by Aims divine,
 and these indignities by showing Mercy to the Poor. And these
 words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 7. 9. Quod si non est continent, no-
 dent. But if they cannot contain, let them marry. Where the
 word (cannot) was obviously inserted to favour the Laps.

